

Attorney Docket TOP 348

REMARKS

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Llewellyn et al. (U.S. 6,127,893) in view of Miller (U.S. 3,863,200) and in view of Mehr (U.S. 6,545,534). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claim 1 includes the limitation "a resistor network comprising a plurality of stages connected serially, coupled between the second input terminal and the *output terminal of the operational amplifier*". In contrast, Fig.2 of Llewellyn et al. discloses a resistor network is coupled between the second input terminal and the *input voltage*. The applicant asserts that claims 1-3 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of Llewellyn.

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Schlotterer et al. (U.S. 5,525,985) in view of Miller (U.S. 3,863,200) and as being unpatentable over Aswell (U.S. 6,703,682) in view of Miller (U.S. 3,863,200). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Applicant has amended independent claim 1 to include the limitation "an input and an output of the resistor network are the input node of the first stage and the output node of the last stage of the resistor network, respectively; *a current of the input of the resistor network is larger than that of the output of the resistor network such that the amplifier circuit has a large-resistance-capacitive time constant*" (emphasis added). No new matter is entered by these amendments. In particular, please refer to Fig.5 which shows that a current (I) at the input of the resistor network is larger than the current (I/32) at the output of the resistor network.

On page 6, lines 5-15, it is stated, "FIG. 5 also shows the current value on each resistor. Because the circuit structure comprises a resistor network comprising five stages, the current value output from the output terminal Vo1 is I/32. In addition, the output current is decreased when the stages of the resistor network increase, such that the capacitor is charged for a longer time. Therefore, higher resistance in the semiconductor circuit is obtained by resistor network structure. Moreover, the structure of the resistor network can be changed, for example, by removing the resistor R29 or R20, removing the resistors R29 and R20, or increasing the total number of current paths to achieve lower output current." In other words, according to the present invention, the amplifier circuit has a large-resistance-capacitive time constant.

Because Schlotterer, Aswell, and Miller do not teach or suggest that a current of the input of the resistor network is larger than that of the output of the resistor network such that the amplifier

AMENDMENT

10/748,667

Attorney Docket TOP 348

circuit has a large-resistance-capacitive time constant, the Applicant asserts that currently amended claims 1 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of Schlotterer, Aswell, and Miller. As claims 2-3 are dependent on claims 1, if independent claims 1 is found allowable, so too should their dependent claims 2-3. Consideration of currently amended claims 1 and their dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 14-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Llewellyn et al. (U.S. 6,127,893) in view of Miller (U.S. 3,863,200) and in view of Mehr (U.S. 6,545,534). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The independent claims 14 includes the limitation "a resistor network comprising a plurality of stages connected serially, coupled between the second input terminal and the output terminal of the operational amplifier."

Because Fig. 2 of Llewellyn et al. discloses "a resistor network is coupled between the second input terminal and the input voltage" and does not teach or suggest "a resistor network is coupled between the second input terminal and the output terminal of the operational amplifier", the Applicant asserts that claims 1-3 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of Llewellyn et al.

The Applicant has amended independent claims 14 to include the limitation "an input and an output of the resistor network are the input node of the first stage and the output node of the last stage of the resistor network, respectively; a current of the input of the resistor network is larger than that of the output of the resistor network such that the resistor network is operated as a large-resistance resistor" (emphasis added). No new matter is entered by these amendments. In particular, please refer to Fig.5 that shows a current (I) of the input of the resistor network is larger than that (I/32) of the output of the resistor network. Additionally, in page 6, line 5-15 it is stated, "FIG. 5 also shows the current value on each resistor. Because the circuit structure comprises a resistor network comprising five stages, the current value output from the output terminal Vo1 is I/32. In addition, the output current is decreased when the stages of the resistor network increase, such that the capacitor is charged for a longer time. Therefore, higher resistance in the semiconductor circuit is obtained by resistor network structure. Moreover, the structure of the resistor network can be changed, for example, by removing the resistor R29 or R20, removing the resistors R29 and R20,

AMENDMENT

10/748,667

Attorney Docket TOP 348

or increasing the total number of current paths to achieve lower output current." In other words, according to the present invention, *the resistor network operates as a large-resistance resistor*.

Because Schlotterer, Aswell, and Miller do not teach or suggest "an input and an output of the resistor network are the input node of the first stage and the output node of the last stage of the resistor network, respectively; a current of the input of the resistor network is larger than that of the output of the resistor network such that the resistor network is operated as a large-resistance resistor", applicant asserts that currently amended claims 14 should be found allowable with respect to the teachings of Schlotterer, Aswell, and Miller. As claims 15-18 are dependent on claims 14, if independent claims 14 is found allowable, so too should their dependent claims 15-18. Consideration of currently amended claims 14 and their dependent claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 7-9 and 12 were stated to be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Because claim 12 is indicated by examiner as being allowable if rewritten to include all limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims, claim 4 is amended to include all limitations of claim 11 and 12, and claims 11 and 12 are canceled. As all dependent claims are now dependent on claim 4, and as currently amended claim 4 includes limitations indicated by examiner as being allowable, applicant hereby requests allowance of the application.

Respectfully submitted,

Nick Bromer

April 9, 2006
Nick Bromer, Reg. No. 33,478
(717) 426- 1664
Rabin & Berdo, PC
(202) 371-8976
(202) 408-5297 fax
Customer Number 23995

AMENDMENT

10/748,667